# Value K

## \*\*\*Shell\*\*\*

#### A. Link – In order to understand value we must understand being; otherwise, we fall into misrepresentations of thought. Being is the organic part of life in which we are all a part of univocal difference. We exist in the virtual as we always have a past and a future. Here we make our expressions that are only based on the actual. To open life in this way we must think in the moment – the aff’s form of valuation undermines what value really is by saying we have to value one thing over another through various normative lenses.

Bergen 6 (Veronique [PhD Philosophy University of Paris 8] “The Precariousness of Being and Thought in the Philosophies of Gilles Deleuze and Alain Badiou” Edinburgh University Press, 2006, pp 62-63, MG)

Deleuze establishes a kind of continuity between being and thought such that, in their simultaneous genesis, an identity between Physis and Nous is sketched, with the result that the engendering process of the mind coincides with the process of generation of things themselves. Being is apprehended as organic life – as a field of immanence in a state of becoming, agitated by fluxes and differences in intensity and produced in a variety of actual cases. Its production occurs along the lines of a genesis inscribed in the virtual-actual couple that is opposed to the schema of the possible-real. The possible-real shuts itself up in the circle of the similar, rendering impossible the emergence of anything original and making the real a mere copy of the possible. Existence, in this case, turns out to be nothing but a selection from a depository of possibles that are already always given. On the other hand, the virtual-actual couple is able to account[s] for the univocity of a being that is never distinct from its existing concretions – its expressions – by positing every actual solution as an ephemeral, creative differenciation, with no resemblance to the virtual problems that it develops. Events are the novel singularities that flash endlessly inside states of affairs. They are the crisis-points that, without any void or break, offer themselves as folds of being and as inflections of the ‘great, cosmic animal’ upon a fluid line along which the continuous and the unheard-of coincide. Precariousness has already struck the ontological ground, to the extent that modes – existing solutions – are but provisional actualisations of ontological problems in a state of perpetual becoming, and the stability of the empirical is only the phenomenal mask of the instability of the transcendental. This precariousness implies that no one can foresee the direction that forces may take and no one can posit a priori the evolution that the processes of actualisation are about to witness. It cannot be otherwise because the intensity that constitutes the ground of being is active at the very level of its actualisations. Forces in a state of perpetual boiling over are the truth of the forms derived from them, and this truth never stops transfixing whatever results from it. Let us keep in mind that the perspectivist grasp of the real, in terms of the intensive differences that Deleuze proposes, presents itself as an ontological affirmation, validated through a thoroughly functionalist and pragmatic criterion: inside the frame of an intensive hierarchy of a Spinozist-Nietzschean character, schizoid thought testifies to a higher truth and to its having reached being beyond the filters of representation, given that this option to think translates itself as an increase of the powers of life. If ideas are measured by the extent to which they bring about an intensification of life, a contrario, the hatred of life that accompanies the embedding of representation in reactive forces testifies to the fact that, in the way it essentialises being, it spoils the perception of the transcendental.

#### This has two impacts

#### 1. It takes out the aff framework – it is impossible to use their framework because they try to value things through representations of the future or a priori facts that are misconstrued.

#### 2. Their normative implications repress us – we are forced to resent or hate life because we can never come to terms with value.

#### We must free ourselves from repression if we are ever to experience value at all. The impact is microfascism.

Jun (Nathan. [PhD Philosophy Midwestern University] “Deleuze and Ethics.” University of Edinberg Press, 2011. 105. PDF. MG)

The process of creating value therefore requires an eternal revolution against the forces of repression wherever and however they arise. It lacks any kind of telos or end goal, since there is always a micro-fascism lurking at the heart of every system of personal value-construction which can, and often will, reterritorialize and overcode that system. Again, such a micro-fascism is every bit as instrumental in producing value as, say, the desire for freedom. It is not the case, therefore, that we ought to oppose what is anti-life, but rather that we must if we are to ever achieve value at all. The fact that the discovery of value is always provisional, tentative, and contingent is hardly a reason not to pursue it. In the end, there may be no ultimate means by which to distinguish one way of living from another, but it is precisely our inability to secure such a means which necessitates an ongoing commitment to ethical life.

#### B. The alternative is to reject the affirmative’s ethical repression and embrace nomadic thought where we recognize that retribution and rehabilitation both have value separate from one another.

Massumi 92 (Brian, [PhD Yale French Literature, Professor at University of McGill], “A User’s Guide to Capitalism and Schizophrenia,” MIT Press, 1992, Print. MG)

“Nomad thought” does not lodge itself in the edifice of an ordered interiority; it moves freely in an element of exteriority. It does not repose on identity; it rides difference. It does not respect the artificial division between the three domains of representation, subject, concept, and being; it replaces restrictive analogy with a conductivity that knows no bounds. The concepts it creates do not merely reflect the eternal form of a legislating subject, but are defined by a communicable force in relation to which their subject, to the extent that they can said to have one, is only secondary. Rather than reflecting the world, they are immersed in a changing state of things. A concept is a brick. It can be used to build the courthouse of reason. Or it can be thrown through the window. What is the subject of the brick? The arm that throws it? The body connected to the arm? The brain encased in the body? The situation that brought brain and body to such a juncture? All and none of the above. What is its object? The window? The edifice? The laws the edifice shelters? The class and other power relations encrusted in the laws? All and none of the above: “what interests us are the circumstances.” Because the concept in its unrestrained usage is a set of circumstances, at a volatile juncture. It is a vector: the point of application of a force moving through a space at a given velocity in a given direction. The concept has no subject or object other than itself. It is an act. Nomad thought replaces the closed equation of representation, x=x= not y with an open equation: …+y+z+a …. Rather than analyzing the world into discrete components, reducing their manyness to the One of self-reflection, and ordering them by rank, it sums up a set of disparate circumstances in a shattering blow. It synthesizes a multiplicity of elements without effacing their heterogeneity or hindering their potential for future rearranging. The modus operandi of nomad thought is affirmation, even when its apparent object is negative. Force is not to be confused with power. Power is the domestication of force. Force in its wild state arrives from outside to break constraints and open new vistas. The space of nomad thought is qualitatively different from space. Air against earth. State space is “striated,” or gridded. Movement in it is confined as by gravity to a horizontal plane, and limited by the order of that plane to preset paths between fixed and identifiable points. Nomad space is “smooth,” or open-ended. One can rise up at any point and move to any other. Its mode of distribution is the nomos: arraying oneself in an open space, as opposed to the logos of entrenching oneself in a closed space.